

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 98-4347**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

RONNIE LEE DUNN,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Anderson. William B. Traxler, Jr., District Judge. (CR-97-761)

---

Submitted: April 9, 1999

Decided: April 27, 1999

---

Before WIDENER, HAMILTON, and LUTTIG, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

C. Carlyle Steele, Jr., Greenville, South Carolina, for Appellant.  
J. Rene Josey, United States Attorney, A. Bradley Parham, Assistant  
United States Attorney, Greenville, South Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.  
See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Ronnie Lee Dunn appeals his convictions for armed bank robbery and use of a firearm during a crime of violence. Dunn alleges the district court erred in two respects. First, that the court violated Fed. R. Evid. 609 by denying his pretrial motion in limine. Second, that the court erred by determining that he should be sentenced as a career offender. See U.S. Sentencing Guidelines Manual § 4B1.1 (1997). We have reviewed the issues raised by counsel and find no reversible error. Thus, we affirm Dunn's conviction and sentence.\*

We do note, however, that the district court's Judgment and Commitment Order appears to have a clerical error with respect to Dunn's conviction for use of a firearm during a crime of violence. The judgment properly notes that Dunn's conviction for Count Two of the superseding indictment is a violation of 18 U.S.C.A. § 924(c)(1) (West Supp. 1999) but erroneously describes the crime as "[p]ossession of a firearm by a convicted felon" rather than a conviction for using and carrying a firearm during a crime of violence. Either party may file a motion in the district court to correct this typographical error under Fed. R. Crim. P. 36. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions

---

\* We grant Dunn's motion for leave to file a pro se supplemental brief, but find no merit in the issues raised by Dunn.

are adequately addressed in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED